

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action mailed June 22, 2006.

Claims 1-8 and 10 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 9 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 5-8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,445 to Lee. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,445) in view of U.S. Patent 5,345,562 to Chen. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,445) in view of U.S. Patent 5,963,502 to Watanabe et al. (hereinafter referred to as Watanabe). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,445) in view of U.S. Patent 5,671,258 to Burns et al. (hereinafter referred to as Burns). These rejections are respectfully traversed based upon the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1-2, 5-8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,445 to Lee. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate a clock generator comprising a first driver for generating a first clock signal and a second driver for driving a second clock signal wherein the first clock signal and the second clock signal have different frequencies from each other, in a predetermined ratio. This amendment is supported in the specification and figures by the clock generator 11 shown in Fig. 4 of the present invention comprising a supplemental divider 17 for dividing signals outputted from a clock synchronization loop DLL in a predetermined ratio and a driver 19 for driving clock signals from the supplemental divider 17.

Lee neither discloses nor suggests the subject matter of the amended claim 1. Accordingly, the invention recited in dependent claims 2, 5-8 and 10 would be deemed novel over Lee for depending on independent claim 1.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,445) in view of U.S. Patent 5,345,562 to Chen. Because Chen does not teach that the clock generator comprises a first driver for driving the first clock signal and a second driver for driving a second clock signal, Lee and Chen do not render claim 3 obvious.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,445) in view of U.S. Patent 5,963,502 to Watanabe et al. (hereinafter referred to as Watanabe). Because Watanabe does not show that the clock generator comprises a first driver for driving the first clock signal and a second driver for driving a second clock signal, Watanabe in view of Chen does not render claim 4 obvious.

Claim 1 cannot be rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,445) in view of U.S. Patent 5,671,258 to Burns et al. (hereinafter referred to as Burns). In item 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner points out that Burns discloses a plurality of reference clock drivers for generating respective reference clock signals (see column 2, lines 47-52). However, Burns does not teach the clock generator 11 shown in Fig. 4 of the present invention, which comprises a supplemental divider 17 for dividing signals outputted from a clock synchronization loop DLL in a predetermined ratio and a driver 19 for driving clock signals from the supplemental divider 17. These features are claimed in independent claim 1. On the contrary, Burns just discloses a plurality of reference clock drivers for generating reference clock signals. Burns fails to show that the frequencies of the plurality of clock signals are in a predetermined ratio. Therefore, the clock generator of independent claim 1 cannot be rendered obvious to one having ordinary skill by Lee in view of Burns.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that all objections and rejections be withdrawn and that a notice of allowance be forthcoming. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned for any reason related to the advancement of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 22, 2006

HELLER EHRMAN LLP
1717 Rhode Island Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202-912-2000
Facsimile: 202-912-2020


Justin T. Darrow
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 54,807

Customer No. 26633